



Article

Comparing the recombinant protein production potential of planktonic and biofilm cells

Alexandra Soares, Luciana Calheiros Gomes and Filipe José Mergulhão *

LEPABE - Department of Chemical Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, University of Porto, Rua Dr. Roberto Frias, 4200-465 Porto, Portugal

*Correspondence: filipem@fe.up.pt; Tel.: (+351) 225081668

Received: date; Accepted: date; Published: date

Abstract: Recombinant protein production in bacterial cells is commonly performed using planktonic cultures. However, the natural state for many bacteria is living in communities attached to surfaces forming biofilms. In this work, a flow cell system was used to compare the production of a model recombinant protein (enhanced green fluorescent protein, eGFP) between planktonic and biofilm cells. The fluorometric analysis revealed that when the system was in steady state, the average specific eGFP production from *Escherichia coli* biofilm cells was 10-fold higher than in planktonic cells. Additionally, epifluorescence microscopy was used to determine the percentage of eGFP-expressing cells in both planktonic and biofilm populations. In steady state, the percentage of planktonic-expressing cells oscillated around 5%, whereas for biofilms eGFP-expressing cells represented on average 21% of the total cell population. Therefore, the combination of fluorometric and microscopy data allowed us to conclude that *E. coli* biofilm cells can have a higher recombinant protein production capacity when compared to their planktonic counterparts.

Keywords: green fluorescent protein; *Escherichia coli*; biofilm; planktonic; flow cell reactor

1. Introduction

Recombinant proteins are currently used in different biotechnological industries and are produced in large amounts in bioreactors [1].

An important step in recombinant protein production is to choose the ideal expression system and factors like protein quality, functionality, production speed and yield should be considered [2]. *Escherichia coli* has been widely used for the production of recombinant proteins due to its fast growth at high cell densities, minimal nutrient requirements, well-characterized genetics and the availability of a large number of cloning vectors [2, 3]. In the early 1980s, the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approved the first recombinant insulin produced in *E. coli* [4] and since then this bacterium is one of the organisms of choice for the production of several commercial recombinant proteins [5].

Most of the research on the expression of recombinant proteins has been based on planktonic bacteria grown in liquid cultures. However, the natural state for many bacteria is to live in communities of sessile cells forming biofilms [6]. Biofilms are communities of surface-attached microorganisms encased in a self-produced extracellular matrix [7]. Such biological organization provides distinct characteristics to bacteria comparing to their planktonic counterparts [8]. For instance, local environmental conditions arising as a result of mass transport limitations, intercellular signaling and other phenomena, may induce biofilm cells to modulate expression of genes differently than in suspended populations [9]. The expression of recombinant proteins in *E. coli* is commonly accomplished by inserting the gene of interest into a multicopy plasmid [10] that imposes a metabolic burden on the host cell [11]. In planktonic cells, this added metabolic burden may decrease cellular growth rates and biomass yields [11], particularly when the plasmid vector is used to the direct

production of a recombinant protein [12]. In contrast, plasmids were shown to increase biofilm formation. In 2007, O'Connell et al. [13] examined the production of eGFP in a chemostat with planktonic cells and in a parallel plate flow cell (PPFC) reactor with biofilm cells. This was the first experiment showing a high-level production of an heterologous protein in *E. coli* biofilms. Although the number of studies on the effect of recombinant protein expression on sessile cells is still scarce, it has been suggested that the biofilm environment benefits recombinant protein production [14, 15].

The aim of this work was to compare the production of a model recombinant protein (enhanced green fluorescent protein, eGFP) between *E. coli* planktonic and biofilm cells. For this purpose, a flow cell system was used that included a recirculating tank, where planktonic cells grow, and a vertical flow cell for biofilm formation. Epifluorescence microscopy was used to evaluate the eGFP production at single-cell level and fluorometry to assess the bulk production.

2. Materials and Methods

Bacterial Strain

The *E. coli* strain JM109(DE3) from Promega (USA) was transformed with the plasmid pFM23 (constructed from pET28A vector, Novagen, USA) for the cytoplasmic production of eGFP [16].

Flow Cell System and Experimental Conditions

A reactor system comprising a recirculating tank (planktonic cells), a vertical flow cell reactor (where biofilms are formed), and peristaltic and centrifuge pumps that allow the circulation of the bacterial suspension was operated as described by Gomes et al. [17]. The flow cell reactor is a semi-circular Perspex duct with apertures on its flat wall to fit removable Perspex pieces (coupons) to which polyvinyl chloride (PVC) slides were glued. The biofilms were developed on the upper faces of the PVC slides that were in contact with the bacterial suspension circulating through the system.

E. coli cells were grown by recirculating the bacterial suspension at 30 °C for 11 days under turbulent flow (Reynolds number of 4600) [17]. The recirculating tank was aerated using an air pump (flow rate of 108 l h⁻¹) and continuously fed with lysogeny medium (LB-Miller, Sigma, USA) supplemented with 20 µg ml⁻¹ kanamycin at a flow rate of 0.025 l h⁻¹ [17].

Biofilm and Planktonic Monitoring

The system was stopped daily, and a coupon was carefully removed from the flow cell for biofilm sampling. The biofilm wet weight and thickness were firstly determined by comparing the coupon weight prior to the start of the experiment and on the sampling day, and by using a digital micrometer [18], respectively. Then, the biofilm was resuspended in 25 ml of sterile saline solution (0.85% NaCl) for total and viable cell quantification and eGFP analysis.

Biofilm total (viable plus non-viable) and viable cell counts were determined using the Live/Dead® BacLight™ bacterial viability kit (Syto9/propidium iodide; Invitrogen Life Technologies, Alfacene, Portugal) as fully described in Gomes et al. [17]. Briefly, bacterial cells from the biofilm suspension were filtered through a Nucleopore Track-Etch Membrane of black polycarbonate (pore size of 0.22 µm; Whatman Ltd, UK), stained for 10 min in the dark and observed using a Leica DM LB2 epifluorescence microscope connected to a Leica DFC300 FX camera (Leica Microsystems Ltd, Switzerland). The image processing software ImageJ v1.48 (NHI, USA) was used to estimate the number of viable and non-viable cells on each membrane from counts of a minimum of 15 fields of view. The final values of biofilm total cells were expressed as log cells cm⁻² of coupon area and the percentage of biofilm viability on each day was calculated by dividing the viable cell counts by the total cell number.

The eGFP expression in biofilm cells was assessed by both epifluorescence microscopy [17] and fluorometry [16]. For the microscopic method, the biofilm suspension was filtered and observed using a Leica DM LB2 epifluorescence microscope. Fifteen fields of view were photographed for each sample in order to estimate the number of eGFP-expressing cells [17]. The percentage of eGFP-expressing cells in the biofilm was then calculated by dividing the number of eGFP-expressing cells by the total number of cells. The specific eGFP production in biofilms was quantified by the

fluorometric method fully described by Mergulhão and Monteiro [16]. Briefly, a volume of biofilm detached cells corresponding to an equivalent optical density (OD) of 1 at 610 nm was centrifuged. The pellet was resuspended in 100 µl of Buffer I (50 mM Na₂HPO₄, 300 mM NaCl, pH 8) and added to 100 µl of Buffer I in a 96-well microtiter plate (Orange Scientific, Belgium). Fluorescence was measured in a microplate reader (SpectraMax M2E, Molecular Devices, Inc., UK) with a 488 nm-excitation filter and a 507 nm-emission filter. Calibration curves were constructed with purified eGFP and the final values were presented as specific eGFP production (fg cell⁻¹). An OD_{610 nm} of 1 corresponds to a cellular concentration of 7.6×10^8 cells ml⁻¹.

For monitoring the planktonic cells, a sample was taken from the recirculating tank to first assess the OD_{610 nm} and the dissolved oxygen (OX 4100 H, Fisher, Germany). Total and viable cell counts, eGFP-expressing cell counts and specific eGFP production were also assessed as previously described for the biofilm cells.

Statistical Analysis

The results presented in Figure 1 originated from averages of triplicate sets obtained in independent experiments. Standard deviations (SDs) on the triplicate sets were calculated for each day and parameter. For planktonic growth (Figure 1(a) and 1(b)), the following SD averages were obtained: SD < 16% for OD_{610 nm} and dissolved oxygen, SD < 4% for total cell counts and SD < 5% for planktonic viability. Concerning biofilm formation (Figure 1(d) and 1(e)), the following SD averages were obtained: SD < 23% for biofilm wet weight, SD < 20% for biofilm thickness, SD < 3% for biofilm total cells and SD < 4% for biofilm viability. Regarding the eGFP quantification (Figure 1(c) and 1(f)) SD < 19% for planktonic eGFP production, SD < 4% for planktonic eGFP-expressing cells, SD < 8% for biofilm eGFP production and SD < 4% for biofilm eGFP-expressing cells were obtained.

Paired t-test analysis was performed based on a confidence level of 95% (differences reported as significant for P values < 0.05).

3. Results

In this work, two fluorescence-based techniques (fluorometry and epifluorescence microscopy) were used with the aim of comparing the eGFP production in planktonic and biofilm populations grown in a flow cell system.

Planktonic growth was monitored during 11 days by measuring the OD_{610 nm} and dissolved oxygen in the recirculating tank (Figure 1(a)) and by quantifying the total cell number and cell viability (Figure 1(b)). The OD_{610 nm} increased until day 4, which is in agreement with the corresponding decrease in the oxygen concentration in the recirculating culture over the same experimental period. Between days 4 and 6, the OD_{610 nm} decreased and then stabilized from day 6 onwards. The same stabilization was observed in the oxygen consumption profile with dissolved oxygen levels around 2 mg l⁻¹, thus it can be concluded that the flow cell system was in steady state between days 6 and 11. Looking at Figure 1(b), the total number of planktonic cells remained practically constant over the experiment. However, the percentage of viability varied significantly (Figure 1(b)) due to oscillations on the number of viable cells during the experimental time (data not shown). Between days 4 and 6, a strong decrease in planktonic viability (from 92% to 42%) was observed. But from day 8 onwards the planktonic viability increased significantly, reaching almost 100% at the end of the experiment.

Regarding the biofilm growth, it was monitored by determining the wet weight and thickness (Figure 1(d)), and by quantifying the total cell number and cell viability (Figure 1(e)) as performed for planktonic cells. Biofilm wet weight remained practically constant during the experimental time, but a slight increase was observed in the last day of the experiment. The evolution of biofilm thickness was similar to the wet weight with average values around 0.104 mm. Figure 1(e) shows that the total number of biofilm cells increased slightly between days 2 and 5, remaining constant until the end of the experiment. Concerning biofilm viability (Figure 1(e)), it is possible to observe a marked reduction in cell viability until day 5 (38%) that resulted in viability percentages of on average 39% until day

11. Note that lower viability percentages were found for biofilms (Figure 1(e)) when compared to planktonic population (Figure 1(b)).




Figure 1. Time-course evaluation of planktonic and biofilm parameters: (a) OD_{610 nm} and dissolved oxygen in the recirculating tank, (b) planktonic total cells and planktonic viability, (c) planktonic eGFP production and percentage of planktonic eGFP-expressing cells, (d) biofilm wet weight and thickness, (e) biofilm total cells and biofilm viability, (f) biofilm eGFP production and percentage of biofilm eGFP-expressing cells. Black circles (●) and squares (■) on the left y-axis, and grey circles (●) and squares (■) on the right y-axis. The means ± SDs for three independent experiments are illustrated.

By analysing the specific eGFP production (Figures 1(c) and (f)), it can be seen that sessile cells produced more recombinant protein than those grown in planktonic state. The biofilm environment enhanced the specific eGFP expression about 10-fold when compared to planktonic cells in steady state (statistically significant differences were confirmed for all experimental days, $P < 0.05$, except on day 2). Additionally, epifluorescence microscopy was used to determine the percentage of eGFP-expressing cells in both planktonic (Figure 1(c)) and biofilm populations (Figure 1(f)). The percentage of eGFP-expressing cells in planktonic state started to increase at day 3, reaching a maximum value of 76% at day 4 and then decreasing abruptly to values around 5% (Figure 1(c)). The equivalent biofilm curve (Figure 1(f)) also shows an initial increase in the percentage of expressing cells (with a maximum value of 87% between days 3 and 4), followed by a strong reduction (of approximately 58%) until day 6. In steady state, the percentage of planktonic expressing cells oscillated around 5%, whereas for biofilms, eGFP-expressing cells represented on average 21% of total cell population. Combining this information with the fluorimetric data, it is possible to conclude that *E. coli* biofilm

cells can have a higher recombinant production capacity when compared to their planktonic counterparts.

4. Discussion

In this study, the production of a model recombinant protein (eGFP) in *E. coli* planktonic and biofilm cells was evaluated by fluorometry (a bulk method) and epifluorescence microscopy (a single-cell method).

We found that the specific eGFP production was lower in planktonic cells and this may have contributed to the higher viability of these cells when compared to biofilm cells. It is well documented that cells bearing a plasmid may suffer from a metabolic burden as cellular resources are being used for its replication and for the expression of plasmid-encoded genes [11, 19, 20]. In particular, a decreased cellular viability of plasmid-bearing cells and an increased protease activity are some stress signals suffered by these cells [21, 22].

The expression of recombinant proteins in *E. coli* biofilms was first reported by Huang et al. [23–25], who have studied the production of β -galactosidase in a chemostat and in a parallel plate flow. These authors found that the recombinant protein was successfully produced in biofilm cells, although at low level than in planktonic cells [23, 25]. In contrast, our results show that the *E. coli* biofilm environment enhanced eGFP production when compared to planktonic cells. This result corroborates that obtained in a previous study of O'Connell et al. [13] who produced eGFP in a chemostat (planktonic cells) and in a PPFC reactor (biofilms). The results of their work indicated that the biofilm environment enhanced both plasmid maintenance and cellular GFP concentrations when compared to planktonic cells. Continuous biofilm cultures for recombinant protein production can be more beneficial for retention of plasmid-bearing cells than chemostats [13] since cells in biofilms tend to grow more slowly than their planktonic counterparts [26], leading to fewer divisions and correspondingly less plasmid segregation. More recently, our research group found that the volumetric productivity of the biofilms developed in the flow cell system is already within the range that can be obtained by conventional high cell density cultures, even before optimization of cultivation conditions [14].

During recombinant protein production, it is essential to monitor the amount of target protein produced in order to find the best processing conditions. The use of a fluorescent protein as a model recombinant protein enables bulk and single-cell quantification. Bulk production can be assessed by fluorometry, which is a high sensitive, specific and simple method with low instrumental costs when compared to other techniques, like flow cytometry, that are also used to follow recombinant protein expression [27, 28]. On the other hand, single-cell analysis by epifluorescence microscopy can provide information about the heterogeneity level of protein expression within a cell population [29]. In this work, the combination of these two techniques showed to be very useful in monitoring recombinant protein production in both planktonic and sessile cells.

5. Conclusions

This study revealed that the specific recombinant protein production and the percentage of eGFP-expressing cells were higher in *E. coli* biofilms than in cell suspension. When combined with a bulk method such as fluorimetry, epifluorescence microscopy and the corresponding image analysis is a valuable tool for determining important production parameters in both planktonic and sessile cells, including the number of cells expressing the recombinant protein within a bacterial population. The information extracted with such single-cell technique can be further used to find the best processing conditions for recombinant protein production in both types of cells.

Acknowledgments: This work was funded by projects POCI-01-0145-FEDER-006939 (Laboratory for Process Engineering, Environment, Biotechnology and Energy – UID/EQU/00511/2013) funded by the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), through COMPETE2020 - Programa Operacional Competitividade e Internacionalização (POCI) and by national funds, through FCT - Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia and NORTE-01-0145-FEDER-000005 – LEPABE-2-ECO-INNOVATION, supported by North Portugal Regional

Operational Programme (NORTE 2020), under the Portugal 2020 Partnership Agreement, through the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF).

Author Contributions: L.C.G. and F.J.M. conceived and designed the experiments; L.C.G. performed the experiments; L.C.G. and A.S. analyzed the data; A.S. wrote the paper.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1. Overton, T.W. Recombinant protein production in bacterial hosts. *Drug Discovery Today* **2014**, *19*, pp. 590-601.
2. Demain, A.L.; Vaishnav, P. Production of recombinant proteins by microbes and higher organisms. *Biotechnology Advances* **2009**, *27*, pp. 297-306.
3. Gopal, G.J.; Kumar, A. Strategies for the production of recombinant protein in *Escherichia coli*. *The Protein Journal* **2013**, *32*, pp. 419-425.
4. Johnson, I.S. Human insulin from recombinant DNA technology. *Science* **1983**, *219*, pp. 632-637.
5. Sanchez-Garcia, L.; Martín, L.; Mangues, R.; Ferrer-Miralles, N.; Vázquez, E.; Villaverde, A. Recombinant pharmaceuticals from microbial cells: a 2015 update. *Microbial Cell Factories* **2016**, *15*, pp. 33.
6. Flemming, H.-C.; Wingender, J.; Szewzyk, U.; Steinberg, P.; Rice, S.A.; Kjelleberg, S. Biofilms: an emergent form of bacterial life. *Nature Reviews Microbiology* **2016**, *14*, pp. 563.
7. Donlan, R.M. Biofilms: microbial life on surfaces. *Emerging Infectious Diseases* **2002**, *8*, pp. 881.
8. Cook, L.C.; Dunny, G.M. The influence of biofilms in the biology of plasmids. *Microbiology Spectrum* **2014**, *2*, pp. 0012.
9. Beloin, C.; Ghigo, J.-M. Finding gene-expression patterns in bacterial biofilms. *Trends in Microbiology* **2005**, *13*, pp. 16-19.
10. Mergulhão, F.J.; Monteiro, G.A.; Cabral, J.M.; Taipa, M.A. Design of bacterial vector systems for the production of recombinant proteins in *Escherichia coli*. *Journal of Microbiology and Biotechnology* **2004**, *14*, pp. 1-14.
11. Hoffmann, F.; Rinas, U. Stress induced by recombinant protein production in *Escherichia coli*. in *Physiological Stress Responses in Bioprocesses*, Springer, Berlin, Germany, 2004; pp. 73-92.
12. Andersson, L.; Yang, S.; Neubauer, P.; Enfors, S.-o. Impact of plasmid presence and induction on cellular responses in fed batch cultures of *Escherichia coli*. *Journal of Biotechnology* **1996**, *46*, pp. 255-263.
13. O'Connell, H.A.; Niu, C.; Gilbert, E.S. Enhanced high copy number plasmid maintenance and heterologous protein production in an *Escherichia coli* biofilm. *Biotechnology and Bioengineering* **2007**, *97*, pp. 439-446.
14. Gomes, L.; Mergulhão, F. Heterologous protein production in *Escherichia coli* biofilms: A non-conventional form of high cell density cultivation. *Process Biochemistry* **2017**, *57*, pp. 1-8.
15. Teodósio, J.; Simões, M.; Mergulhão, F. The influence of nonconjugative *Escherichia coli* plasmids on biofilm formation and resistance. *Journal of Applied Microbiology* **2012**, *113*, pp. 373-382.
16. Mergulhão, F.J.; Monteiro, G.A. Analysis of factors affecting the periplasmic production of recombinant proteins in *Escherichia coli*. *Journal of Microbiology and Biotechnology* **2007**, *17*, pp. 1236.
17. Gomes, L.; Carvalho, D.; Briandet, R.; Mergulhão, F. Temporal variation of recombinant protein expression in *Escherichia coli* biofilms analysed at single-cell level. *Process Biochemistry* **2016**, *51*, pp. 1155-1161.

18. Teodósio, J.; Simões, M.; Melo, L.; Mergulhão, F. Flow cell hydrodynamics and their effects on *E. coli* biofilm formation under different nutrient conditions and turbulent flow. *Biofouling* **2011**, *27*, pp. 1-11.
19. Xia, X.-X.; Qian, Z.-G.; Ki, C.S.; Park, Y.H.; Kaplan, D.L.; Lee, S.Y. Native-sized recombinant spider silk protein produced in metabolically engineered *Escherichia coli* results in a strong fiber. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **2010**, *107*, pp. 14059-14063.
20. Yang, Y.-X.; Qian, Z.-G.; Zhong, J.-J.; Xia, X.-X. Hyper-production of large proteins of spider dragline silk MaSp2 by *Escherichia coli* via synthetic biology approach. *Process Biochemistry* **2016**, *51*, pp. 484-490.
21. Diaz Ricci, J.C.; Hernández, M.E. Plasmid effects on *Escherichia coli* metabolism. *Critical Reviews in Biotechnology* **2000**, *20*, pp. 79-108.
22. Kurland, C.; Dong, H. Bacterial growth inhibition by overproduction of protein. *Molecular Microbiology* **1996**, *21*, pp. 1-4.
23. Huang, C.T.; Peretti, S.W.; Bryers, J.D. Plasmid retention and gene expression in suspended and biofilm cultures of recombinant *Escherichia coli* DH5 α (pMJR1750). *Biotechnology and Bioengineering* **1993**, *41*, pp. 211-220.
24. Huang, C.T.; Peretti, S.W.; Bryers, J.D. Effects of medium carbon-to-nitrogen ratio on biofilm formation and plasmid stability. *Biotechnology and Bioengineering* **1994**, *44*, pp. 329-336.
25. Huang, C.-T.; Peretti, S.W.; Bryers, J.D. Effects of inducer levels on a recombinant bacterial biofilm formation and gene expression. *Biotechnology Letters* **1994**, *16*, pp. 903-908.
26. Williams, I.; Venables, W.A.; Lloyd, D.; Paul, F.; Critchley, I. The effects of adherence to silicone surfaces on antibiotic susceptibility in *Staphylococcus aureus*. *Microbiology* **1997**, *143*, pp. 2407-2413.
27. Bongaerts, R.J.; Hautefort, I.; Sidebotham, J.M.; Hinton, J.C. Green fluorescent protein as a marker for conditional gene expression in bacterial cells. in *Methods in Enzymology*, Clark, V.L.; Patrik M.B., Elsevier, 2002; 358, p. 43-66; 978-0-12-182261-3.
28. Naresh, K. Applications of Fluorescence Spectroscopy. *Journal of Chemical and Pharmaceutical Sciences* **2014**, *974*, pp. 2115.
29. Webb, D.J.; Brown, C.M. Epi-fluorescence microscopy. in *Cell Imaging Techniques*, Taatjes, D.; Roth, J.; Springer: Humana Press, Totowa, U.S.A. 2012; p. 29-59.



© 2018 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).